

III. REMARKS

Claims 1, 8-10 and 13-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8-10 and 13-22 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Matsuda et al., US 2002/0133573 (“Matsuda”), with Poger et al., US 6,772,420 B1 (“Poger”), providing intrinsic evidence for a device type being embedded in a MAC address, in view of Okano et al. US 2002/0062485 (“Okano”). Claims 2-7 and 11-12 were previously canceled. Claims 1, 10, 14 and 19 are amended. Claims 23-26 are new. Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 USC 103(a) rejections for the reasons provided below.

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 8-10 and 13-22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claims 1, 8-10 and 13-22 over Matsuda with Poger providing intrinsic evidence, in view of Okano, Applicant asserts that the combined references cited by the Office fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to recite: “receiving a set of device entries at a server.” Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in the specification at paragraph [0025] lines 1-5.

Claim 1 (and similarly claims 10, 14, and 19) has been amended to delete: “wherein the generating of a unique device identifier is automatically performed by the server or a unique device identifier is manually selected.” This limitation is now recited as new dependent claim 23 (and similarly claims 24, 25, and 26).

Claim 1 (and similarly claims 10, 14, and 19) recites, *inter alia*: “wherein the generating is based on a particular user and a particular device.” The Office cites [0064] and [0065] lines 1-7 of Matsuda in support of its rejection with respect to this feature. Office Action p.4. The Office cites [0065] lines 27-38 in support of its rejection of the feature “generating a unique device identifier.” Office Action p.3. Without conceding the Office’s assertion, the modifying discussed by Matsuda is not “based on a particular user and a particular device.” Sections [0064] and [0065] lines 1-7 of Matsuda are not directed to “generating a unique device identifier” and, thus, cannot address the basis for “generating a unique device identifier.”

Claim 1 (and similarly claims 10, 14, and 19) recites, *inter alia*: “wherein the unique device identifier of every device entry is stored permanently in every respective device corresponding to every device entry for subsequent communication with the server.” The Office cites [0079] of Matsuda in support of its rejection with respect to this feature referring to “static addresses, or static ID.” Office Action p.4. While this section of Matsuda does state “static addresses,” there is no evident support in Matsuda for the Office’s assertion that this reference “inherently includes permanently storing IP addresses.” Further, claim 1 recites “stored permanently in every respective device” (emphasis added). Without conceding the Office’s assertion, Matsuda states “allocate

some static addresses” (emphasis added). Therefore, the cited section of Matsuda cannot teach or suggest “stored permanently in every respective device.”

Claim 1 (and similarly claims 10, 14, and 19) recites, *inter alia*: “obtaining one of the set of device entries based on correlation data for a particular device.” The Office cites [0065] lines 7-14 of Matsuda in support of its rejection with respect to this feature. Office Action p.4. This section of Matsuda describes “acquires the MAC address.” Without conceding the acquisition as “obtaining one of the set of device entries,” the cited section provides no support for a basis of the acquiring as being based on correlation data with the correlation data including “device type, user data, and device identifier status” as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 (and similarly claims 10, 14, and 19) recites, *inter alia*: “setting the device identifier status to indicate that the device identifier for the device entry is pending after communicating the device identifier.” The Office admits that Matsuda does not teach this feature. Office Action p.5. The Office cites Okano at paragraphs [0092] in support of its allegations. Office Action p.5. The Office states in its “Response to Arguments” in support of this allegation that paragraph [0092] states “temporarily allocated.” Office Action p.2. The phrase “temporarily allocated” does not teach or suggest this feature and fails to clarify how the cited paragraph teaches or suggests the feature.

Applicant asserts the Office’s reasoning fails to explain its allegation that Okano teaches or suggests “setting the device identifier status to indicate that the device identifier for the device entry is pending after communicating the device identifier” and asserts that none of the cited references teach or suggest the feature.

Applicant submits that the combined references cited by the Office fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1 (and similarly claims 10, 14 and 19).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With respect to the dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicant submits that all dependent claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/David E. Rook/

David E. Rook
Reg. No.: 40,790

Date: May 20, 2009

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)